



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/068,079	02/05/2002	Josef Ezra	07072-149001	7456

22494 7590 03/30/2005

DALY, CROWLEY & MOFFORD, LLP
SUITE 101
275 TURNPIKE STREET
CANTON, MA 02021-2310

EXAMINER

MASKULINSKI, MICHAEL C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2113

DATE MAILED: 03/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/068,079	Applicant(s) EZRA ET AL.	
	Examiner Michael C Maskulinski	Art Unit 2113	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 January 2005.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,4-9 and 12-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 2,3,10 and 11 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 26 January 2005 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Final Office Action

Drawings

1. In view of the recent amendments, the drawing objections have been withdrawn. Further, the drawing changes have been accepted.

Specification

2. In view of the recent amendments, the objections have been withdrawn.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
4. Claims 1, 4-9, and 12-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Willems et al., U.S. Patent 6,804,813 B1.

Referring to claim 1:

- a. In column 6, lines 23-38, Willems et al. disclose debugging a target machine with an analysis debugger (selecting targets on different processors at a target site).
- b. In column 4, lines 27-36, Willems et al. disclose a remote debugger with a symbol resolution system (associating each target with a session and the session with a symbol table).
- c. In column 4, lines 48-58, Willems et al. teach using the session to direct debugger information to the target with which the session is associated.

Referring to claim 4, in column 4, lines 48-58, Willems et al. disclose that each session is node specific (the session is different for each of the targets).

Referring to claim 5, in column 4, lines 59-65, Willems et al. disclose that the symbol resolution system of the symbolic kernel debugger has a library of symbol files. This library contains symbol files suitable for several operating system versions that could be found on a target machine. The symbol resolution system automatically identifies the operating system version present on the target machine and locates appropriate symbol files in its library (determining that the executable binary codes of the targets each have a different symbol table).

Referring to claim 6, in column 4, lines 48-58, Willems et al. disclose that each command plug-in has operating specific knowledge and related commands. This knowledge includes by way of example and not of limitation knowledge of the format of each node of, and the root symbol name of, the process list. These commands include, for example, commands to display processes, with names, and the threads linked to those processes (the session uses the symbol table with which it is associated to determine an address to be associated with the debugger information, the symbol table corresponding to the executable binary code on at least one of the targets).

Referring to claims 7 and 9, in column 4, lines 48-58, Willems et al. disclose that each command plug-in has operating specific knowledge and related commands. This knowledge includes by way of example and not of limitation knowledge of the format of each node of, and the root symbol name of, the process list. These commands include, for example, commands to display processes, with names, and the threads linked to

Art Unit: 2113

those processes. Further, in column 4, lines 59-65, Willems et al. disclose a library of symbol files suitable for several operating system versions that could be found on a target machine (the session uses the symbol table with which it is associated to determine an address to be associated with the debugger information, the symbol table corresponding to the executable binary code on more than one of the targets).

Referring to claim 8, in column 2, lines 5-8, Willems et al. disclose that the symbol resolution system uses a list to translate symbolic requests by service personnel into memory addresses having variables to be read or function entry points to be called or intercepted (the targets correspond to executable binary code that executes on a storage controller of a data storage system).

Referring to claims 12, 13, and 14:

- a. In column 6, lines 23-38, Willems et al. disclose debugging a target machine with an analysis debugger. Further, in column 6, lines 61-65, Willems et al. discloses displaying data for viewing by service personnel on a display apparatus (using a single user interface coupled to a debugger tool at the debugger site to select at least two targets running on separate processors at the target site).
- b. In column 4, lines 27-36, Willems et al. disclose a remote debugger with a symbol resolution system (associating each target with a session and the session with a symbol table).
- c. In column 4, lines 48-58, Willems et al. teach using the session to direct debugger information to the target with which the session is associated.

Allowable Subject Matter

5. Claims 2, 3, 10, and 11 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Response to Arguments

6. Applicant's arguments filed January 26, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

7. On pages 8-9, under the section REMARKS, the Applicant argues, "Willems neither describes nor suggests 'selecting targets running on different processors at a target site.'" The Examiner respectfully disagrees. In column 12, lines 28-37, Willems et al. disclose multiple processor machines. Further, in column 14, lines 23-27, Willems et al. disclose more than one target machine.

8. On page 9, under the section REMARKS, the Applicant argues, "Willems neither describes nor suggests 'associating each target with a session and the session with a symbol table' as is further set forth in claim 1." The Examiner respectfully disagrees for at least the reasons in the rejection above. Further, in column 4, lines 59-65, Willems et al. disclose a library of symbol files suitable for several operating system versions that could be found on a target machine. Once a debug session is established these files are associated with the session. Therefore, Willems et al. teach associating each target with a session and the session with a symbol table.

Art Unit: 2113

9. On page 9, under the section REMARKS, the Applicant argues, "since Willems does not contemplate the claimed session, the reference also does not describe or suggest 'using the session to direct debugger information to the target with which the session is associated' as is further set forth in claim 1." The Examiner respectfully disagrees for at least the reasons set forth above in the rejection.

10. On page 10, under the section REMARKS, the Applicant argues, "Willems neither describes nor suggests using a single interface to select at least two targets running on separate processors at the target site as set forth in claim 12, a single user interface to select at least two targets running on separate processors at the target site as set forth in claim 13, or means for using a single user interface at least two targets running on separate processors at the target site as set forth in claim 14." The Examiner respectfully disagrees for the reasons set forth in paragraph 7 above.

Conclusion

11. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of

Art Unit: 2113


the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C Maskulinski whose telephone number is (571) 272-3649. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday 9:30-6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MM


SCOTT BADERMAN
PRIMARY EXAMINER